




I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail, Label No. EV711311586US, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Dated: September 29, 2005 Signature: 

(Maggie C. Hamelin)

Atty. Docket No. 62962CIP(52398)
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of: Jed Arkin et al.

Application No.: 09/977,863

Filed: October 15, 2001

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR PREVENTING
THE INFRINGEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY RIGHTS

Confirmation No.: 4296

Art Unit: 2145

Examiner: P. L. Winder

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the action mailed from the Office on August 29, 2005, applicants provide the following remarks.

First, applicants' undersigned representative thanks Examiner Winder for the telephone discussion on September 28, 2005, during which the restriction requirement was discussed and during which applicants' undersigned representative indicated reasons why claim groups I, II, III, and IV are related and should be examined together.

The claims of claim group IV generally are directed to a data structure and a method involving a data structure. The claims of claim groups I, II, and III generally are directed to network nodes. The nodes can access the data structure over a network, and the nodes also can communicate over that network.

There is overlap among the claims of claim groups I, II, III, and IV. As an example of this overlap, please note that claim 66 of claim group IV generally is directed to uploading an item to a network and forwarding an item query to repository nodes, and this generally can be found in at least some claims in claim group II. Also, claim 67 of claim group IV generally is directed to receiving the item query by a repository node, and this generally can be found in at least some claims in claim group I. In addition, claim 94 of claim group IV generally is directed to adjusting load, and this generally can be found in at least some claims in claim group III. These are just three examples of the overlap among the claims of claim groups I, II, III, and IV.

Applicants elect claim group IV, but applicants submit that claim groups I, II, III, and IV can and should be examined together in this application. The claim groups are related, as indicated in the prior paragraphs. Examining claim groups I, II, III, and IV together does not place a serious burden on the Examiner. In fact, because these four claim groups are related in at least the ways indicated in the prior paragraphs, it should be helpful to, and more efficient for, the examiner to address the claims of claim groups I, II, III, and IV together as a single group instead of taking them separately one group at a time.

Applicants thus elect claim group IV, but request reconsideration of the restriction requirement and examination of claim groups I, II, III, and IV together.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert J. Tosti

Registration No. 35,393

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP

P.O. Box 55874, Boston, MA 02205

Dated: September 29, 2005

Direct phone: 617-517-5584

